



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,828	03/22/2004	Svava Maria Atladottir	ACS-64880 (4171DX)	4223

24201 7590 10/02/2007
FULWIDER PATTON LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6060 CENTER DRIVE, TENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

HOUSTON, ELIZABETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3731

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/02/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/806,828

Applicant(s)

ATLADOTTIR ET AL.

Examiner

Elizabeth Houston

Art Unit

3731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 38-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/03/05, 04/26/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-15 and 38-42, drawn to apparatus, classified in class 623, subclass 1.35.
 - II. Claims 16-26, drawn to method of making, classified in class 264, subclass 632.
 - III. Claims 27-37, drawn to method of using, classified in class 623, subclass 1.11.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions III and I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the apparatus as claimed can be used with a materially different method such as with a balloon catheter. In the instant case the method as claimed can be used to deliver a stent that does not have a number of peaks in the central section that is different from the number of peaks in the proximal and distal sections.
3. Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2)

Art Unit: 3731

that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the stent as claimed can be made with a materially different process such as laser cutting or extrusion molding. In the instant case the method as claimed can be used to make a materially different product such a stent that does not have a central section that flares outward radially.

4. Inventions III and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions have different modes of operation.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);

(d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;

(e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable

Art Unit: 3731

over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

5. During a telephone conversation with John Nagy on 08/29/07 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of (I) apparatus, claims 1-15 and 38-42. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 16-37 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-10, 15, 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Seguin (WO 97/46174).

9. Seguin discloses a self-expanding stent for treating a bifurcated vessel. The stent has a plurality of rings connected by links (9). The stent has a proximal section (5),

Art Unit: 3731

distal section (8) and central section (6 and 7). The number of peaks in the central section differs from the number of peaks in the distal and proximal section. The central section flares outward radially into an opening to the side branch vessel (see Figs. 6 and 7). The proximal section has 7 first peaks. (Since the proximal section has at least 7 first peaks, it meets the requirement regardless of whether or not there are more than 7 first peaks. The fact that the stent may have additional structure not claimed is irrelevant.) The distal section has 6 peaks and the central section has 8 peaks. The number of first peaks in the rings of the central section is greater than the number of peaks in any of the rings of the proximal or distal sections. The central opening is offset radially from the proximal and distal openings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sequin (US 6,068,655) in view of Guruwaiya (US 6,251,136).

12. Sequin discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the layer of drug and the primer material.

Art Unit: 3731

13. Guruwaiya discloses a stent coated with a primer layer, which readily adheres to the material of the stent and is in turn constructed to retain a layer of pharmacological agent (Col 2: L20-34). Guruwaiya discloses that it is well known to be beneficial to deliver drugs with stents to treat problems such as thrombosis or neointimal hyperplasia. Guruwaiya further discloses using a primer layer of a polymer that more readily carries and releases the drugs as a benefit to layering the drug directly to the stent material.

14. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a drug layer into the bifurcated stent since it is an old and well known enhancement to be able to treat the tissue with drugs while at the same time providing the treatment of the stent. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a primer layer between the stent layer and the drug layer since the primer layer will more readily carry and release the drug that the stent material may not be able to carry and release.

15. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sequin.

16. As to claim 41, Sequin teaches a bifurcated stent substantially as claimed but is silent as to how the stent is formed. The claimed phrase "formed from a single hypotube" is being treated as a Product by Process limitation. As set forth in the MPEP 2113, "Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-

Art Unit: 3731

process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted) (See MPEP § 2113). Examiner will thus evaluate the product claims without giving much weight to the method of its manufacture.

17. Thus, even though, Seguin is silent to the process used to form the stent, it appears that the product disclosed by Seguin would be the same or similar as that claimed; especially since both applicant's product and the prior art product are a bifurcated stent with a middle section that flares into the branch vessel.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth Houston whose telephone number is 571-272-7134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3731

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

eh



ANH TUAN T. NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
2/28/07.